arXiv:1703.00789v1 [physics.chem-ph] 2 Mar 2017

Proton tunneling in hydrogen bonds and its possible implications in an induced-fit model of enzyme catalysis

Onur Pusuluk,[1] Tristan Farrow,[2,3] Cemsinan Deliduman,[4] Keith Burnett,[5] and Vlatko Vedral[2,3]

[1]*Department of Physics, İstanbul Technical University, Maslak, İstanbul, 34469 Turkey*
[2]*Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PU, UK*
[3]*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543, Singapore*
[4]*Department of Physics, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Bomonti, İstanbul, 34380, Turkey*
[5]*University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK*

(Dated: March 3, 2017)

The role of proton tunneling in biological catalysis remains an open question usually addressed with the tools of biochemistry. Here, we map the proton motion in a hydrogen-bonded system into a problem of pseudo-spins to allow us to approach the problem using quantum information theory and thermodynamics. We investigate the dynamics of the quantum correlations generated through two hydrogen bonds between a prototypical enzyme and a substrate, and discuss the possibility of utilizing these correlations as a resource in the catalytic power of the enzyme. In particular, we show that classical changes induced in the binding site of the enzyme spreads the quantum correlations among all of the four hydrogen-bonded atoms. If the enzyme suddenly returns to its initial state after the binding stage, the substrate ends in a quantum superposition state. Environmental effects can then naturally drive the reaction in the forward direction from the substrate to the product without needing the additional catalytic stage that is usually assumed to follow the binding stage. We find that in this scenario the enzyme lowers the activation energy to a much lower value than expected in biochemical reactions.

Enzymes are macromolecules that catalyze biological reactions. Each one can act upon one or more specific molecules known as a substrate. Molecular biology relates this high specificity to substrate to the hydrophilic or the hydrophobic, geometric and electronic characteristics of the enzyme primarily determined by trivial quantum effects responsible for bonding. Effects such as quantum superposition, tunneling, and entanglement are usually thought to play no significant role in the catalytic activity of the molecule.

The favoured model for the enzyme and the substrate interaction is the induced-fit mechanism [1], which enhances the recognition specificity in a noisy environment [2]. This model states that although initial intermolecular interactions are weak, they trigger a continuous conformational change in the binding site of the enzyme. This provides the structural complementarity between the enzyme and the substrate, in the manner of a lock and key. The catalytic site of the enzyme then accelerates the conversion of the substrate into different molecules, or products. This enzymatic speed-up can be achieved in several ways, such as by destabilizing the substrate, or by stabilizing the transition state between the substrate and the product, or by leading the reaction into an alternative chemical pathway.

Observed rates of several enzyme-catalyzed reactions can not be explained solely in terms of transition-state theory without a quantum-mechanical correction for the tunneling of Hydrogen (H) species [3–11]. This introduces the possibility of quantum mechanical contribution to biological catalysis. Conversely, there is also evidence suggesting that quantum tunneling in some enzymes does not enhance reaction rates [12–17]. The role of tunneling of H species in catalytic reactions remains the subject of debate [18]. The problem has so far not been considered from a quantum theoretical perspective, an approach that stands to yield new insights.

One of the key determinants of the unique structure adopted by an enzyme is H-bonding as it is in charge of the initial stages of protein folding [19]. It also plays a direct role in binding to a substrate and in driving the catalysis during the enzyme's activity. Although it is assumed to have an electrostatic nature, non-trivial quantum effects enter into the physics of H-bonding in the form of tunneling.

In a H-bonded system designated as $X_1{-}H\cdots X_2$ (Fig. 1), X_1 is the proton-donor atom/group and X_2 is the proton-acceptor atom/group. This system is defined by three geometric parameters: the length of the single $X_1{-}H$ covalent bond (r_1), the separation between X_1 and X_2 (R_{12}) and the bond angle ($\phi_{12} \equiv \angle HX_1X_2$). The nucleus of the H atom is likely to tunnel back and forth between the donor and acceptor due to orbital interactions. Thus, a general H-bond has to be described by a quantum superposition state:

$$|X_1{-}H\cdots X_2\rangle \rightarrow a|X_1{-}H\cdots X_2\rangle + b|X_1\cdot\cdots H{-}X_2\rangle. \quad (1)$$

To show the quantumness of this state, it is advantageous to use a zero/one proton qubit representation, i.e. $|X{-}H\rangle \equiv |1\rangle$ and $|X{:}\rangle \equiv |0\rangle$. Indeed, Eq. 1 is nothing but an entangled state in this representation, i.e, $a|10\rangle + b|01\rangle$.

We map the proton motion in a H-bonded system into a problem of pseudo-spins. Proton locations (labeled in



FIG. 1: (a) A simple depiction of the H-bonded atoms/groups X_1 and X_2. When the proton of the H atom resides at location $i = \{1, 2\}$, X_i is called the proton-donor. (b) Elongation of the covalent bond between the H atom and the proton-donor (solid black stick) is an indicator of a H-bond (dashed black line). Due to intermolecular orbital interactions, the proton tunnels back and forth through the H-bond as shown by the two-sided arrow.



FIG. 2: A substrate (S), transition state structure ($S^{\ddagger}$), and product (P) in a putative tautomerization reaction. S and P are constitutional isomers. Intermolecular conversion from S to P is nothing more than the relocation of a proton from X_1 to X_2. However, this relocation is not possible because of the large bond angle ϕ_{12}. Thus, the molecule undergoes a conformational change resulting in an unstable intermediate structure. This corresponds to the highest potential energy along the reaction coordinate, allows a bond angle smaller than $\pi/2$ facilitating orbital interactions.

Fig. 1a) can be regarded as a crystal lattice in which H^+ ions, or protons, move 'n accordance w'th the Hamiltonian

$$H_{HB} = \sum_{j=1}^{2} W_j n_j - J(a_1^\dagger a_2 + a_1 a_2^\dagger) + V n_1 n_2 + \lambda, \quad (2)$$

where $n_j = a_j^\dagger a_j$ is the proton number operator at lattice site j, $a_j^\dagger$ and a_j are respectively proton creation and annihilation operators that obey the fermion anticommutation relations. On-site energy W_j can be taken to be the total potential felt by a proton at jth site. V is introduced to penalize di-hydrogen bonds. λ is a constant responsible for the total intermolecular interactions between the donor and acceptor, encompassing Pauli repulsion, Van der Walls interaction, and London dispersion. Finally, J stands for the orbital interactions that drive proton tunneling. Functional dependence of this hopping coefficient on the geometric parameters r, R, and ϕ can be written in a similar way to the coupling constant of diabatic state models [20, 21] as below:

$$J = J_0 \cos(\phi) \frac{R - r\cos(\phi)}{\sqrt{R^2 + r^2 - 2Rr\cos(\phi)}} \mathrm{e}^{-b(R-R_0)}, \quad (3)$$

where J_0, b, and R_0 depend on the chemical identities of donor, acceptor and their environment.

To obtain a pseudo-spin Hamiltonian by preserving the anti-commutation relations, we apply the Jordan-Wigner transformation for a_j, $a_j^\dagger$, and n_j in (2) with the convention for Pauli z operator that $\sigma_z^{(j)} = |0_j\rangle\langle 0_j| - |1_j\rangle\langle 1_j|$. Then, we arrive at a two-spin Heisenberg XXZ model under one homogeneous and one inhomogeneous magnetic field,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{HB} = {} & J_x(\sigma_x^{(1)} \otimes \sigma_x^{(2)} + \sigma_y^{(1)} \otimes \sigma_y^{(2)}) + J_z\, \sigma_z^{(1)} \otimes \sigma_z^{(2)} \\ & + (B + b)\, \sigma_z^{(1)} + (B - b)\, \sigma_z^{(2)} + \tilde{\lambda}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with parameters $J_x = J/2$, $J_z = V/4$, $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda + (2W_1 + 2W_2 + V)/4$, $B = -(W_1 + W_2 + V)/4$, $b = -(W_1 - W_2)/4$.

Next, we consider a special case of structural isomerism that requires a chemical equilibrium of the different isomer forms or so-called tautomers, which differ only in the locations of their protons. A putative tautomerization event is shown in Fig. 2. To reduce complexity, a substrate (S) is assumed to be converted to a product (P) only by the movement of a proton from one atom/group to another. Such a movement of the proton is likely to take place during intramolecular H-bonding. However, transition state theory states that more reactive intermediates are involved in the conversion of S to P. Such an unstable intermediate structure corresponds to a saddle point on the potential energy surface is called a transition state and is denoted by $S^{\ddagger}$.

In the following, each of the locations allowed for the proton in this process is regarded as a pseudo-spin coupled to each other by a H-bonding interaction. To prevent a direct transition from S to P by intramolecular proton hopping, bond angles ϕ_{12} and ϕ_{21} are taken to be $\pi/2$ (Eq. 3). In other words, the H-bonding interaction between the pseudo-spins of either S or P isn't assumed to have a quantum character. We can collect all the other degrees of freedom (apart from the pseudo-spins) in the molecular structure into a single macromolecular configuration and label its ground state as $|G\rangle_C$. Any significant difference in the molecular structure isn't expected due to the classical interactions between X_1 and X_2 that are weaken or strengthen depending on the location of the proton in H-bond. Thus, we can assign the same ground state to both S and P: $|S\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |10\rangle_{12}$ and $|P\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |01\rangle_{12}$. Conversely, a more energetic

configuration, $|E\rangle_C$, should be assigned to $S^\ddagger$ as the proton tunneling between the pseudo-spins requires a bond angle less than $\pi/2$. Note that, the ground and excited states of the molecular configuration, $|G\rangle_C$ and $|E\rangle_C$, which we can visualize them like macromolecular logic qubits $|0\rangle_L$ and $|1\rangle_L$, need not to include any quantum degree of freedom.

At this point, it is possible to describe the tautomerization process as transitions between energy levels of a single Hamiltonian constructed as:

$$\begin{aligned} H_S = & E_g|G\rangle_C\langle G| + E_e|E\rangle_C\langle E| \\ & + |G\rangle_C\langle G| \otimes H_{HB}^{(12)}(r, R, \phi = \pi/2) \\ & + |E\rangle_C\langle E| \otimes \widetilde{H}_{HB}^{(12)}(r', R', \phi' < \pi/2), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

since the first three eigenstates of this Hamiltonian correspond to S, $S^\ddagger$, and P:

$$\begin{cases} \epsilon_1 = E_g + W_1 + \lambda, & |\epsilon_1\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |10\rangle_{12} \equiv |S\rangle, \\ \epsilon_2 = E_g + W_2 + \lambda, & |\epsilon_2\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |01\rangle_{12} \equiv |P\rangle, \\ \epsilon_3 = E_e + \epsilon_- + \widetilde{\lambda}, & |\epsilon_3\rangle = |E\rangle_C \otimes |\epsilon_-\rangle_{12} \equiv |S^\ddagger\rangle, \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

where $|\epsilon_-\rangle = (\eta_-|10\rangle_{12} + |01\rangle_{12})/(1+\eta_-^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\epsilon_- = (\widetilde{W}_1 + \widetilde{W}_2 - \sqrt{(\widetilde{W}_2 - \widetilde{W}_1)^2 + 4\widetilde{J}^2})/2$, and $\eta_- = -(\widetilde{W}_1 - \widetilde{W}_2 + \sqrt{(\widetilde{W}_1 - \widetilde{W}_2)^2 + 4\widetilde{J}^2})/2\widetilde{J}$.

The representation of different molecules like S, $S^\ddagger$, and P as eigenstates of a single Hamiltonian seems to be an oversimplification, since each of these molecules is the ground state of a separate Hamiltonian with many electronic levels. However, this is nothing more than a projection of all the extrema of a potential energy surface onto a single energy spectrum. We can understand it as a unification of all the chemical species along a reaction coordinate into a hypothetical generic molecule. Thus, it shares a common feature with some important conceptual tools widely used in chemistry. Additionally, such a generic model enables us to explore the spontaneous tautomerization reaction from S to P.

In the absence of enzymes that catalyze the reactions, the interaction between the system and environment should be responsible for the subsequent state transformations $|S\rangle \leftrightarrow |S^\ddagger\rangle \rightarrow |P\rangle$ and $|P\rangle \leftrightarrow |S^\ddagger\rangle \rightarrow |S\rangle$. Compartmentalization in the atoms/groups of substrate need to be carefully taken into account during the construction of environment, i.e. the configuration atoms/groups and the pseudo-spins are expected to be coupled to different environments in different ways. For example, the configuration states are likely to exchange energy with a heat bath B in a reversible manner

$$H_{BC} = \sum_k g_k\,|G\rangle_C\langle E| \otimes b_k^\dagger + g_k^*\,|E\rangle_C\langle G| \otimes b_k, \tag{7}$$

where $b_k^\dagger$ and b_k are phonon creation and annihilation operators associated with the kth oscillator mode of the bath. These bath operators can be thought to be related to the bending or libration modes that change the orientation of X_1 and X_2. As these atoms/groups are covalently bonded to the rest of the molecule, such vibrations should be dependent on the orientation of the whole other atoms/groups close to them. However, dominant environmental effect on the proton should be originated from the X_j-H stretch vibrations that aren't expected to affect rest of the molecule in a significant way. These oscillations can be incorporated into our model when the position of the proton is linearly coupled to the equilibrium positions of phonons through

$$H_{\tilde{B}S} = \sum_{j=\{1,2\}} \sigma_z^{(j)} \otimes \sum_k \tilde{g}_{k,\alpha}\,(\tilde{b}_{k,\alpha}^\dagger + \tilde{b}_{k,\alpha}). \tag{8}$$

where $\tilde{b}_{k,j}^\dagger$ and $\tilde{b}_{k,j}$ are phonon creation and annihilation operators of a second heat bath $\tilde{B}$ and they are associated with the kth oscillator mode at the jth proton location. In other words, the interaction of the pseudo-spins with this second heat bath $\tilde{B}$ destroys the quantum correlations between them and has no further effect on the configuration.


$|S\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |10\rangle_{12}$
H_{BC}
H_{BC}
$|S^\ddagger\rangle = |E\rangle_C \otimes (\alpha|10\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}|01\rangle)_{12}$
H_S
$|E\rangle_C \otimes |10\rangle_{12}$
H_{BC}
$H_{\tilde{B}S}$
$|G\rangle_C \otimes (\alpha|10\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}|01\rangle)_{12}$
$|E\rangle_C \otimes \{p = \alpha^2, |10\rangle_{12}; p = 1-\alpha^2, |01\rangle_{12}\}$
H_{BC}
$H_{\tilde{B}S}$
$\{p = \alpha^2, |S\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |10\rangle_{12}; p = 1-\alpha^2, |P\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |01\rangle_{12}\}$

FIG. 3: Sequence of spontaneous tautomerization due to environment effects. The initial state $|S\rangle$ evolves to $|E\rangle_C \otimes |10\rangle_{12}$ due to the interaction between the system and the environment through H_{BC}. Then the internal dynamics of the molecule drives the evolution towards the transition state $|S^\ddagger\rangle$. Finally, the interactions with the two environments through H_{BC} and $H_{\tilde{B}S}$ in arbitrary order lead to a mixture of $|S\rangle$ and $|P\rangle$.

These system-environment interactions together with the self-Hamiltonian (see Eq. 5) are sufficient to construct a model for spontaneous tautomerization as shown in Fig. 3. The tautomerization in the absence of an enzyme is modeled as follows: transformation from a tautomer to the transition state is initialized by the excitation of configuration atoms/groups due to an energy absorbtion from the heat bath B. Immediately after this excitation, the self-Hamiltonian of the molecule drives the evolution towards the transition state as it generates quantumness between the pseudo-spins. Transformation from the transition state to the other tautomer requires both (i) the destruction of the quantumness of the pseudo-spins by the dephasing environment $\tilde{B}$ and



FIG. 4: (a) Hypothetical interaction where two intermolecular H-bonds are formed between an enzyme and the substrate. (b) Changes occur in the binding site of the enzyme in accordance with the induced-fit model. Although this conformational change is classical, it increases the proton tunneling rates in intermolecular H-bonds. As the angle ϕ_{43} becomes smaller than $\pi/2$, it spreads the intermolecular quantum correlations among all of the four X_i atoms involved in the process. Some of this quantumness can be transferred to the substrate when the enzyme suddenly returns to its initial state.


$|S\rangle \otimes |E\rangle = |G\rangle_C|10\rangle_{12} \otimes |G'\rangle_{C'}|01\rangle_{34}$
$H_{HB}^{(13)} + H_{HB}^{(24)}$
$|G\rangle_C \otimes |G'\rangle_{C'} \otimes (\alpha|10\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}|01\rangle)_{13} \otimes (\beta|01\rangle + \sqrt{1-\beta^2}|10\rangle)_{24}$
$H_{HB}^{(13)} + H_{HB}^{(24)} + H_{HB}^{(34)}$
$|G\rangle_C \otimes |E'\rangle_{C'} \otimes (a|0011\rangle + b|0101\rangle + c|0110\rangle + d|1001\rangle + e|1010\rangle + f|1100\rangle)_{1234}$
$H_{BC'}$
$|G\rangle_C \otimes |G'\rangle_{C'} \otimes (a|0011\rangle + b|0101\rangle + c|0110\rangle + d|1001\rangle + e|1010\rangle + f|1100\rangle)_{1234}$
$\mathbf{I}_{12} \otimes |01\rangle_{34}\langle 01|$
$|G\rangle_C \otimes (b'|01\rangle + d'|10\rangle)_{12} \otimes |E\rangle$
H_{BS}
$\{p(S) = d'^2, |S\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |10\rangle_{12}; p(P) = b'^2, |P\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |01\rangle_{12}\} \otimes |E\rangle$

FIG. 5: $X_1{-}H\cdots X_3$ and $X_2\cdots H{-}X_4$ H-bonds are initially weak and induce conformational change in the binding site of the enzyme: $|G'\rangle_{C'} \rightarrow |E'\rangle_{C'}$. Then intermolecular H-bonds become more linear and stronger. In the meantime, the intramolecular interaction between X_3 and X_4 gains a quantum character. Four-qubit entanglement generated in this way can be transferred to the substrate when the enzyme's configuration and pseudo-spins subsequently return their initial states. This can enable the conversion of S to P without requiring a high energetic reaction barrier as above.

(ii) the loss of energy from configuration atoms/groups to the first heat bath B. These two interactions in arbitrary order lead to a mixture of two tautomers.

As the configuration state represents the whole atoms/groups in substrate (except for the proton of the H atom whose locations are regarded as pseudo-spins), the occurrence of its excitation is quite rare. Since the spontaneous inter-conversion of tautomers requires this excitation to be initialized, its occurrence is rare also. Conversely, enzymes can make these state transformations faster, as we will show below.

We imagine a generic molecular recognition event where two H-bonds are formed between the enzyme and the substrate (Fig. 4). Two allowed proton locations in the binding site of the isomerase enzyme are also regarded as pseudo-spins. However, unlike the ones in the substrate, these pseudo-spins are assumed to be continuously tilted by the intermolecular interactions. Thus, the bond angles ϕ_{13} and ϕ_{42} become smaller. Although this conformational motion is supposed to be classical, it is expected to increase the quantumness of the intermolecular H-bonds that strengthen the binding interaction in enzyme-substrate (ES) complex. In the meantime, the angle ϕ_{43} and the inter-spin separation R_{43} both change during the binding stage. Hence, quantum correlations may emerge between the atoms/groups X_3 and X_4 as well.

We assume that the quantumness of each three H-bonds shown in Fig. 4b is sustained until the enzyme undergoes a conformational change that converts it back to the initial state. This is described by a sudden post-selection measurement on the pseudo-spins of the enzyme which follows the loss of energy from configuration atoms/groups of the enzyme (C') to the heat bath B. In other words, the conformational motion under interest occurs fast over a time scale that is small compared to the decoherence time enforced by the heat bath $\tilde{B}$. This is quite reasonable as (i) enzymes are usually very large molecules, which implies a high sensitivity to their excited configurations to the heat bath, and (ii) the H-bonded atoms/groups are partially isolated from their environment until the detachment of ES complex.

We can elaborate on this scenario as follows: entanglement generated at the end of the binding stage is shared among all of the four pseudo-spins (see Fig 5). Some of this four-qubit entanglement can be transferred to the pseudo-spins of the substrate when a post-selection measurement converts the pseudo-spins of enzyme back to their initial product state. Such entanglement transfer potentially creates a superposition of the substrate and product states of the molecule. Then, this superposition rapidly decoheres as the pseudo-spins couple to the dephasing environment. Finally, collapse of the superposition leads to a mixture of two tautomers.

Bath descriptions in our model can be upgraded to include more realistic correlation functions, including temperature dependence. It is also possible to discuss the effects of the temperature without needing an extension of the current model.

As E_g and E_e are significantly higher than the other components in the eigenenergies given in Eq. 6, the evolution of configuration and pseudo-spins in the molecule



FIG. 6: Alternative reaction pathways from S to P. Uncatalysed S (solid line) requires a high activation energy to reach $S^{\ddagger}$. Enzyme (E) is expected to lower this energy by stabilizing the transition state ($ES^{\ddagger}$). Quantum correlations generated through H-bonds enable the enzyme to lower the activation energy down to a much lower value in-between the energies of S and P.

can be assumed to be separated. Then, we can solve a master equation for the pseudo-spins when the molecule is fixed in the configuration and use this solution in the evolution of the configuration.

When this configuration is in the ground state $|G\rangle_C$, there isn't any coupling between the pseudo-spins (Eq. 5) while the pseudo-spin-environment interaction H_{BC} (Eq. 7) leads to decoherence. On the other hand, there is a non-vanishing coupling between the pseudo-spins when the configuration state is $|E\rangle_C$. Eq. 7 drives the evolution to a detailed balance between $|\epsilon_-\rangle_{12}$ and $|\epsilon_+\rangle_{12}$ in this case, i.e. the pseudo-spins' state relaxes to the athermal attractor state $\rho_{12}^{inf} = P_-|\epsilon_-\rangle\langle\epsilon_-| + P_+|\epsilon_+\rangle\langle\epsilon_+|$ where $P_\pm = e^{-\beta\epsilon_\pm}/(e^{-\beta\epsilon_+} + e^{-\beta\epsilon_-})$.

Using this approximation, we can compare the uncatalysed and catalyzed reactions as follows. The initial state in an uncatalysed reaction should be $|S\rangle = |G\rangle_C \otimes |10\rangle_{12}$ and the open system dynamics bring the molecule to the state $P_g|G\rangle\langle G|_C \otimes |10\rangle\langle 10|_{12} + P_e|E\rangle\langle E|_C \otimes \rho_{12}^{inf}$ where $P_{g/e} = e^{-\beta E_{g/e}}/(e^{-\beta E_g} + e^{-\beta E_e})$. It means that we will observe the molecule in the substrate state $|S\rangle$ with a probability of P_g that is approximately equal to one at low temperatures. Increasing the temperature enhances the occurrence of the transition state, although the molecule cannot be converted to the product state $|P\rangle$ in this approximation, even if the environment reaches high temperatures.

Conversely, the initial state of a catalyzed reaction should be taken as $|G\rangle_C \otimes (b'|01\rangle + d'|10\rangle)_{12}$, the state of the molecule immediately after the enzyme returns to its initial state. In this case, the stationary solution becomes $d'^2 P_g|G\rangle\langle G|_C \otimes |10\rangle\langle 10|_{12} + b'^2 P_g|G\rangle\langle G|_C \otimes |01\rangle\langle 01|_{12} + P_e|E\rangle\langle E|_C \otimes \rho_{12}^{inf}$. This means that the enzyme converts the molecule into the product state $|P\rangle$ with a probability of $b'^2 P_g$. b' depends on the strength of the H-bonds formed in the enzyme-substrate interaction, as does the efficiency of the catalysis. Moreover, increasing the temperature may have a positive effect on the frequency of the product in this approximation.

In summary, we showed that the quantumness of the H-bonds can be used as a resource in an induced-fit mechanism that brings the molecule into a quantum superposition of the substrate and the product. This increases the occurrence of the product even if the conversion of the substrate to the product isn't possible in the absence of the enzyme. However, the advantageous of this scenario goes beyond that. As the expected value of the energy for the superposition state should be in-between the individual energies of the substrate and the product, the enzyme provides an alternative reaction pathway with much smaller activation energy (Fig. 6). Moreover, such a reactive pathway doesn't require anything more than a passive transformation of the enzyme's configuration in the catalytic stage.

O.P. thanks TUBITAK 2214-Program for financial support. T.F. and V.V. thank the Oxford Martin Programme on Bio-Inspired Quantum Technologies, the EPSRC and the Singapore Ministry of Education and National Research Foundation for financial support.

[1] Koshland, D. E., Application of a theory of enzyme specificity to protein synthesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **44**, 98–104 (1958).

[2] Savir, Y. and Tlusty, T., Conformational proofreading: the impact of conformational changes on the specificity of molecular recognition. *PLoS ONE* **2**, e468 (2007).

[3] Cha, Y., Murray, C.J., and Klinman J.P., Hydrogen tunneling in enzyme reactions. *Science* **243**, 1325–1330 (1989).

[4] Antoniou, D. and Schwartz, S.D., Large kinetic isotope effects in enzymatic proton transfer and the role of substrate oscillations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **94**, 12360-12365 (1997).

[5] Kohen, A., Cannio, R., Bartolucci, S., Klinman, J.P., Enzyme dyamics and hydrogen tunneling in a thermophilic alcohol dehydrogenase. *Nature* **399**, 496–499 (1999).

[6] Masgrau, L., Roujeinikova, A., Johannissen, L.O., Hothi, P., Basran, J., Ranaghan, K.E., Mulholland, A.J., Sutcliffe, M.J., Scrutton, N.S., Leys, D., Atomic description of an enzyme reaction dominated by proton tunneling. *Science* **312**, 237-241 (2006).

[7] Dutton, P. L., Munro, A. W., Scrutton, N. J., and Sutcliffe, M. J., Introduction. Quantum catalysis in enzymes: beyond the transition state theory paradigm. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **361**: 1293–1294 (2006).

[8] Sutcliffe, M. J., Masgrau, L., Roujeinikova, A., Johannissen, K. E., Hothi, P., Basran, J., Ranaghan, K. E., Mulholland, A. J., Leys, D., and Scrutton, N. J., Hydrogen tunnelling in enzyme-catalysed H-transfer reactions: flavoprotein and quinoprotein systems. *Phil. Trans. R.*

Soc. B **361**: 1375–1386 (2006).

[9] Allemann, R.K. and Scrutton, N.S., Quantum tunnelling in enzyme-catalysed reactions. RSC, Cambridge (2009).

[10] Glowacki, D. R., Harvey, J. N., and Mulholland, A. J., Taking Ockham's razor to enzyme dynamics and catalysis. *Nat. Chem.* **4**, 169–176 (2012).

[11] Klinman, J. P. and Kohen, A., Hydrogen tunneling links protein dynamics to enzyme catalysis. *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* **82**, 471–496 (2013).

[12] Hwang, J.K., Chu, Z.T., Yadav, A., Warshel, A. Simulations of quantum-mechanical corrections for rate constants of hydride-transfer reactions in enzymes and solutions. *J. Phys. Chem.* **95**, 8445-8448 (1991).

[13] Hwang, J.K. and Warshel, A., How important are quantum mechanical nuclear motions in enzyme catalysis? *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **118**, 11745-11751 (1996).

[14] Doll, K.M., Bender, B.R., Finke, R.G., The first experimental test of the hypothesis that enzymes have evolved to enhance hydrogen tunneling. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **125**, 10877-10884 (2003).

[15] Olsson, M.H., Siegbahn, P.E., Warshel, A., Simulations of the large kinetic isotope effect and the temperature dependence of the hydrogen atom transfer in lipoxygenase. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **126**, 2820-2828 (2004).

[16] Williams, I.H., Quantum catalysis? A comment on tunnelling contributions for catalysed and uncatalysed reactions. *J. Phys. Org. Chem.* **23**, 685-689 (2010).

[17] Bothma, J. P., Gilmore, J. B., and McKenzie, R. H., The role of quantum effects in proton transfer reactions in enzymes: quantum tunneling in a noisy environment? *New J. Phys.* **12**, 055002 (2010).

[18] Ball, P., By chance, or by design? *Nature* **431**, 396–397 (2004).

[19] Rose, G. D., Fleming, P. J., Banavar, J. R., and Maritan, A., A backbone-based theory of protein folding. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 16623–16633 (2006).

[20] McKenzie, R. H., A diabatic state model for donor-hydrogen vibrational frequency shifts in hydrogen bonded complexes. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **535**, 196–200 (2012).

[21] McKenzie, R. H., Bekker, C., Athokpam, B., and Ramesh, S. G., Effect of quantum nuclear motion on hydrogen bonding. *J. Chem. Phys.* **140**, 174508 (2014).